DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 937 FL 014 694

AUTHOR Baker, Opal Ruth
TITLE Categories of Code-Switching in Hispanic Communities: Untangling the Terminology. Sociolinguistic Working Paper Number 76.
INSTITUTION Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 80
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classification; *Code Switching (Language); English; Hispanic Americans; *Language Styles; Language Usage; Linguistic Borrowing; *Research Methodology; *Spanish Speaking

ABSTRACT

Research on Spanish/English code switching is reviewed and the definitions and categories set up by the investigators are examined. Their methods of locating, limiting, and classifying true code switches, and the terms used and results obtained, are compared. It is found that in these studies, conversational (intra-discourse) code switching is separated from situational (stylistic) code switching because the latter is motivated by obvious social factors while the former may have various motivations. Also, intrasentential switching is found to be more interesting linguistically than intersentential switching because of its complexity. In such research, it has usually been found necessary to exclude terms already borrowed by the community. Proficiency, attitude, and education are all seen to affect the type of code switching engaged in, but some common rules are followed. It is concluded that the different results obtained by investigators may be due to different analysis methods and to different ways of classifying switches. A comparison of classification schemes clarifies what is and is not code switching for the improvement of future data gathering and analysis methods. One conclusion is that there is little justification for the educational system's prevailing stigma associated with language mixing, because linguistic borrowing is not a corruption of language but an inevitable and natural process in language contact. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED250937

CATEGORIES OF CODE SWITCHING IN HISPANIC COMMUNITIES: UNTANGLING THE TERMINOLOGY*

Opal Ruth Baker

The University of Texas at Austin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SEDL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL014694

Sociolinguistic Working Paper

NUMBER 76

September, 1980

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

211 East Seventh Street

Austin, Texas

CATEGORIES OF CODE SWITCHING IN HISPANIC COMMUNITIES: UNTANGLING THE TERMINOLOGY*

Opal Ruth Baker

The University of Texas at Austin

I. PURPOSE

The research which has been done on code switching in Hispanic communities of the United States is confusing and difficult to understand, not only because of different samples and methods but also because of the overlapping terminologies employed to describe code switching categories. In this report, I will review some of the work on Spanish/English code switching, and will compare data and conclusions which have resulted from that research. By examining the definitions given for the various classifications, I will try to determine where the terms applied to them refer to the same, similar, overlapping, or completely distinct phenomena, so as to clarify the discussion of code switching.

II. BACKGROUND AND BASIC TERMINOLOGY

Speakers of a language are not normally limited to one kind of speech but use various ways of speaking. Depending on the person addressed, the setting, or the topic, they may use formal, informal, casual or intimate registers or styles. If someone uses formal style in a setting calling for informal style, their speech will be perceived by the other participants as stilted or affected; for example, a student talking to friends in a formal register might be perceived as pretentious. On the other hand, if a speaker uses a casual style when formality is expected, their behavior may be seen as incongruent or humorous; for example, a casual style in a speech at a professional conference could cause amusement in the audience. Similarly, different dialects may be used in different settings and with different listeners. For instance, a speaker of a non-standard dialect will speak in the most standard manner possible in a job interview or other formal situation.

Thus, it is apparent that monolingual speakers have a repertoire of various kinds of speech which they learn to manipulate more fully as they

*This paper was submitted as an M.A. report in linguistics at The University of Texas at Austin, in May 1980.

grow to adulthood and develop communicative competence: the ability to use language appropriately in its social context. Bilingual speakers have this repertoire in two different languages, thereby presenting a more complicated system that in some aspects is harder to analyze. However, one aspect of the speech behavior of bilinguals is, on the surface, easier to observe and describe than alternation between registers or dialects, and that is the alternation between their two languages which is called code switching and which is the subject of this paper.

A change to another language is more obvious than a change to another dialect or register. Lucía Elías-Olivares (1976:179), in her discussion of shifts between Standard Spanish, Popular Spanish and Caló, observes that: "since these cases are not always discrete, it is difficult to attribute segments of speech to one variety or the other." Nevertheless, all of these behaviors are related and might be seen as a continuum, with register or style shifting, being the most subtle, at one end; with dialect shifting in the middle as more pronounced and noticeable; but not as abrupt as code switching at the other extreme. Although in the past the term switching has often been used for all of these behaviors, it is more descriptive to use shifting for the first two alternations, and to reserve switching for the last, precisely to convey the perceived abruptness of code switching as opposed to the more subtle alternations of style or dialect.[1]

Style shifting, then, is the alternation from one dialect or style to another within discourse while code switching is the alternation from one language to another within discourse. Both monolinguals and bilinguals may engage in the first kind while only bilinguals employ the second.

Upon close analysis, code switching itself is found to have various varieties, one of which is very much like style shifting, because it occurs at the same places in discourse where style shifting usually occurs and appears to have similar social functions. Such a code switch may take place because:

1. The listener has changed, entailing a language switch if:
   (a) the new listener speaks the other language better.
   (b) the speaker is accustomed to use the other language with the new listener.
   (c) non-participants enter the area of the speech encounter. This may cause a switch either to, or from, the language they speak.

2. The setting has changed, entailing a language switch because the other language is habitually used in the new setting, or it is seen as more appropriate.
3. The topic has changed, entailing a language switch because the other language is associated with the new topic

Social functions which also might be signaled by such a code switch are: the marking of solidarity or distance relationships with the listener, the marking of status and role of speaker and listener, and the indication of informal or formal topic, situation, or event. This kind of code switching, which John Gumperz (1974) has called situational[2] is an object of study by sociolinguistics because it is easier to hear and to describe than style shifting, but can shed light on the same kinds of problems for discourse analysis.

In another kind of code switching, which Gumperz labels conversational, the listener, setting and topic remain constant, and therefore are not the factors which cause the switch to another language. This conversational kind of code switching, which is the subject of the research examined in this report, is also investigated by sociolinguistics because, just as with any kind of speaking, other more subtle social factors have nevertheless been found to influence it. Conversational code switching is of most interest to linguistics in general because it frequently occurs within sentences, and within constituents, and raises questions of just what model of grammar would generate these kinds of utterances.

III. DEFINITIONS AND CATEGORIES IN THE LITERATURE

Researchers investigating Spanish/English code switching in recent years have observed a number of different varieties which will be described here. Their studies have dealt with the locations of switches, with necessary limitations on types to be collected and examined, and with classifications of informants and data.

1. Locating The Switches

The most important distinction apparent in the recent literature is the one which differentiates intersentential switches, that is, switching between sentences or at sentence boundaries, from switching within sentences, which is labeled intrasentential. These terms may not always mean the same thing. For example, in her study of code switching among families in the home, Ana Huerta (1978:128) defined intersentential to mean "between

utterances" and intrasentential to mean "within an utterance," and stated that an utterance is the "production of a speaker within a single breath," and "may consist of a sentence, a word, a phrase, etc." Shana Poplack (1979) also uses the term extrasentential, which will be explained in more detail below, but which she defines as switching not requiring much attention to the relationship between the grammars of the two languages.

2. Limiting The Data

In order to narrow down the behavior to be studied, investigators have attempted to limit their definitions of code switching in the following ways.

A. Borrowing Vs. Switching

When two languages come into contact, "the language-using individuals are . . . the locus of the contact," as Uriel Weinreich has written (1964:1). The differences between the two languages then become very salient to these speakers, who consequently try to make them more alike, so to speak, by filling in what is lacking in each one with constructions from the other, i.e., by linguistic borrowing.

Once code switching is carefully scrutinized it becomes apparent that linguistic borrowing is one of its strongest motivations; indeed, that code switching could be thought of as the beginning of the borrowing process, which proceeds from the individual speaker to the community at large. Einar Haugen (1969:383) maintains that borrowing "goes on wherever bilingual speakers arise. It must therefore in its origin be a process that takes place in each bilingual before it is projected as group behavior."

In defining what constitutes code switching, researchers usually agree that words or expressions already borrowed by the community, although they probably started out as switches, should no longer be thought of as such. (Erica McClure, 1977:8). This is especially true of words which are listed in the dictionaries of the other language and are used by monolingual speakers. These include such Spanish-origin words as gringo, macho, Chicano, tortilla; such English-origin expressions as bell boy, baseball, okay, hotcakes, pie; and all proper names.

Some researchers also exclude the borrowings of each separate speech community so these vary according to the Hispanic group being studied, and the region in which they live. In studying the code switching of the

Puerto Rican-Americans of New York City, for example, Poplack (1979:36) considers the words cute, team, and junkies to be terms already borrowed by the community. In addition, she excludes terms which are integrated to the base language on all levels: phonologically, morphologically, and syntactically; and also names for food, people and places, regardless of phonological rendering. Such words as expressway are excluded by Rodolfo Jacobson (1976) even if they are unadapted phonologically. Elías-Olivares (1976:187) excludes English nouns such as robber and present even if they "maintain the English pronunciation." Huerta (1978) defines borrowings as terms which are not available in one language, are consistently used by the community, and may be considered to have become part of the other language, whether or not they are phonologically adapted.

It is apparent, then, that the criteria for distinguishing borrowing from code switching generally have to do with the usage of the speech community as a whole. Besides borrowing, the other type of data that is usually eliminated is that caused by known triggers of switches.

B. Known Triggers

Certain circumstances are known to trigger, or to be associated with, code switches and therefore these kinds of switches may be separated from their data by researchers. Some of these circumstances are:

1. Translations or explanations.

   Example (Lance, 1975:146):

   But what I usually buy are those thick ones, las más gruesas. (the thickest ones.)

   Example (McClure, 1977:21):

   . . . Will you watch your cards! Fijáte en las cartas! (pay attention to the cards!)

2. Idioms.

   Example (Huerta, 1978:38):

   That's her tough luck.

3. Repetitions from previous utterances of other speakers.

   Example (Huerta, 1978:38):

   M: Ahora ya no le van a dar bottle. (Now, they're not going to give you a bottle.)

   L: Quiere la bottle? (You want the bottle?)

4. Quotations.

   Example (Elías-Olivares, 1976:208):

Mi hija siempre me dice, "When are you gonna get those pictures mom?" (My daughter always says to me . . .)

3. Classifying Informants

There is evidence, which will be treated in more detail below, that the education and attitude of speakers influence the type of code-switching behavior that they will engage in. Likewise, the degree of language proficiency of a speaker is a very important point to establish, because it has also been shown to affect code switching. Jacobson (1976) places bilinguals on a continuum, from Spanish dominant at one end to English dominant at the other; in the middle are the speakers who learned both languages in the home, and who do the most code switching -- compound bilinguals. Poplack (1979:73) calls these speakers, who are equally proficient in both languages, balanced bilinguals. She determined their proficiency by matching ethnographic observations with the speakers' own reports, and found that balanced bilinguals did more intrasentential switching than extrasentential switching, while the reverse was true for Spanish-dominant speakers. McClure (1977:10) found similar results in that children who were fluent bilinguals generally code switched at the constituent level, while less proficient children tended to switch at the word level.

4. Classifying Code Switches

Of all the researchers whose work is treated here, Carol Pfaff (1976: 248) has the broadest definition of code switching. She concentrates on conversational code switching where "participants, topic and social setting remain constant," and on intrasentential switching, but does not limit the data in any other way. Huerta's definition is the next most inclusive; she excludes only borrowings: single-item terms that are proper nouns or names of particular places or things, "items that cannot be translated," from true code switching.

Examples of these (Huerta, 1978:44) are:

(a) Give her some tortilla, Pancha.

(b) Pues, el corvette de Chito. (Well, Chito's corvette.)

(c) Que no hay excedrin? (Isn't there any excedrin?)

(d) . . . cuando íbamos a Phoenix. (. . . when we used to go to Phoenix.)

Researchers have found that some words and expressions, although they can occur within sentences and are therefore technically intrasentential,

are different from other elements switched, because they can be placed anywhere in the sentence without disrupting its grammar or causing a restructuring. These have, therefore, usually been separated from other intrasentential data collected. They include fillers such as uh, este, you know and te digo; exclamations such as oh!, ay!, or Dios mío!, and some idiomatic expressions such as ándale. It is assumed that the use of these intrasententially does not require as high a degree of bilingual competence as do other elements which must be grammatically integrated. Gumperz and Eduardo Hernández-Chávez (1978:280) classify these, together with loan words, as ethnic identity markers and exclude them from true code switching.

Poplack (1979) calls switching of such expressions, which are not very translatable, emblematic code switching, and distinguishes it from intimate code switching, which consists of integral parts of the syntactic structure of a sentence switched at word, phrase, or clause level. Although both can occur within sentences, she designates the emblematic kind extrasentential because it does not require as much attention to grammatical rules, since these elements can usually be placed anywhere in the sentence. She also includes whole-sentence switches in this extrasentential or emblematic kind. She observes that some researchers call only intimate switching true code switching, but Poplack herself does not make this distinction, viewing them both as code switching but as different types, engaged in by speakers with different degrees of competence. In her study (1979), balanced bilinguals were observed to use both, while speakers who were Spanish or English dominant used mostly emblematic. Following are examples (1979:17-18):

INTIMATE	--	Why make carol SENTARSE ATRAS PA' QUE everybody has to move PA' QUE SE SALGA?	(Why make Carol sit in the back so everybody has to move for her to get out?)
EMBLEMATIC	--	Salían en sus carros y en sus SNOWMOBILES	(They would go out in their cars and in their snowmobiles.)

To account for intimate switching, Poplack has proposed a combined grammar for balanced bilinguals, "a single code-switching grammar composed of the overlapping sectors of the grammars of L_1 and L_2." (1979:70). Similarly, Huerta (1978) postulates a combined mental storage system for the lexicons of the two different languages.

Other researchers have used a different descriptive classification. McClure (1977) and James Wentz (1977) distinguish between code-mixing and code-changing. Code-mixing is the interspersing of elements from one language into a sentence of the other language. Code-changing is the complete changing over from one language to the other at some point in the sentence. McClure and Wentz both point out that code-mixed sentences are felt to be "in one language" while code-changed sentences are felt to be "in both languages." Examples (from McClure, 1977:7-9):

CODE-MIX -- I put the tenedores on the table. (forks)
CODE-CHANGE -- I put the forks en las mesas. (on the tables)

Jacobson distinguishes true code switching from semi-code-switching, in which latter he includes borrowing, terminology, loan translation and momentary lack of access. Half of this overlaps with the code-mixing definition of McClure, which does include momentary lack of access and individual lack of a term (individual borrowing) but does not include community borrowing or loan translation. Code-mixing could also be viewed as overlapping with Poplack's intimate and emblematic types. However, code-changing does not have much reality in the work of other researchers. It overlaps with both intrasentential and intersentential switching, since it can take place at the boundary of a noun phrase, verb phrase, or sentence. McClure defines it as an "alternation of languages at the level of the major constituent (e.g. NP, VP, S) . . . a complete shift to another language system." This is not usually regarded as a different kind of switching but merely as switching of larger chunks or constituents, which may continue until the end of a sentence or go on past the beginning of a new sentence or utterance. It does not fit Poplack's description of her data since she does not treat the sentence as the unit of reference, but rather examines stretches of discourse. Rather than talking about the "language of the sentence," she looks at the base language of utterances, and finds that, in intimate switching, a single turn of conversation can switch base languages several times and these may be maintained across sentence boundaries. (Poplack, 1979:34-35). Huerta (1978:52-53) also uses the term base language in this way, but in a case study of the code switching in the home setting of two families, she also uses it to mean "the language predominantly used

in the home," thus designating as a code switch only those instances of "a deviation from this into the other language."

Working from such a base-language perspective affects the way the data is analyzed. Huerta (1978:54-55) explains that, because her data was conversational:

> A switch into Spanish/English was presumed to include, or occur with, a switch back to English/Spanish (respectively) because the setting was constant . . . and so [the latter] . . . was not counted as an additional switch.

The following full utterance (Huerta, 1978:35) would be considered one switch because the base language of the speaker is English:[3]

F: Y tienes proof? (And do you have proof?)

With this approach, full sentences uttered in the language that is not the base language for that particular speaker would be called intersentential switches. (This may account for the apparent preference for intersentential switches by Huerta's subjects, see below.)

Pfaff (1976:249) does not use this perspective but counts all changes of language as switches:

F1: Sí, (2) but the thing is (3) que empiezan bien recio (4) and then they slack off. (that they start real fast)

It is thus obvious that whichever perspective is used to analyze the data will have implications for the quantities and categories which result, and thus for the conclusions drawn. It is not at all clear how each researcher is approaching this question. Gumperz and Hernández-Chávez (1978:282) evidently do not utilize the base-language concept since they call the Spanish utterance below a code switch because it follows an English utterance:

E: I want to use it as [. . . as an example of how Chicanos can shift back and forth from one language to another.

M: Ooo. Como andábamos platicando. (Oh, Like we were saying.)

In contrast, Huerta (1978:34) calls the same phenomenon cross language reference because obviously the base-language perspective prohibits regarding this as a code switch:

Mi: Que esta estudiando? (What is she studying?)

A: She's trying to finish up her Master's.

Poplack's papers do not include examples relevant to this point so it is unclear how she deals with it.

IV. COMPARISON OF RESULTS

Not enough data has so far been collected for any Hispanic community to make a comparison of the results very meaningful. However, a few of the patterns which seem to emerge with regard to kinds of, constraints on, and motivations for, code switches are listed below. Because of the varying methods, samples, and communities, however, these can only be considered possible points for further investigation.

1. Kinds Of Switches Favored

In the study by McClure (1977:11) about half of the total code-mixes were single nouns. Single-word and noun-phrase switches predominated in the data of Elías-Olivares (1976:216). Poplack (1979:45) found that single nouns were the most frequently switched intrasentential items (9.5% of total switches), while tags and full sentences were the most frequently switched extrasentential items (22.5% and 20.3% of total switches).

Poplack et al (1979:7) have stated that code switching types seem to coincide with bilingual proficiency as follows:

	SWITCH TYPES	FAVORED BY
1.	Tag-like switching.	Speakers who are dominant L_1.
2.	Sentence switching.	Speakers who are intermediate.
3.	Within-sentence switching.	Speakers who are balanced.

While Poplack's data from the New York Puerto Rican community supports strongly the first and third correspondences, it is not so obvious that the second category of full-sentence switching is an intermediate step. Furthermore, research in Chicano communities gives apparently different results but, since there are so many differences in data collection and analysis, these may be misleading. The most true code switches produced by the fluent bilinguals whose conversations were recorded by Gumperz and Hernández-Chávez (1978:281) were "entire sentences inserted into the other language text." Data from the Austin, Texas Chicano community gathered by Elías-Olivares (1976:212-13), also indicates that balanced bilinguals switched

more "between sentences, rather than within sentences or clauses." However, in neither of these studies is a tabulation of data given to support this, nor are the methods of analysis set out precisely. Among the eight primary subjects in Huerta's (1978) study of two Chicano families, full-sentence switches predominated in the code switches of the seven balanced bilinguals, while the remaining subject, who was apparently Spanish-dominant, produced no full-sentence switches, but her analysis methods could be responsible for this outcome as was previously mentioned.

McClure's work with Chicano children (1977:10) indicated that fluent bilinguals (the older children) switched full sentences most often, while children who were dominant in one language switched single words most often. This could be viewed as supporting the intermediate step claim by Poplack, if the fluent children are considered to be still in a developmental stage. Further support for this is given by the fact that only older children switched full constituents within sentences.

With regard to adults, the education of the speakers may have a bearing on this. Elías-Olivares (1976:213) says that "speakers who have been exposed to formal learning of the two languages possess a pattern in which code switching consists of entire sentences inserted into the other language text." The most educated of Huerta's subjects also switched full sentences more (but, again, this may be due to the base-language perspective). If it is found to be true that educated speakers tend to switch full sentences, it could be attributed to the fact that code switching has been stigmatized and that once a person has switched at the beginning of a sentence, they feel obligated to continue until the end in that language so as not to appear "uneducated." They may feel that mixing within sentences is more discredited and therefore try to avoid it. That the speaker's attitude definitely plays a part is noted by Huerta (1978:97). The data from one of her subjects shows more intrasentential switching and, upon further investigation, it is brought out that the speaker "has expressed a positive attitude towards code-switching; i.e., she finds it quite convenient to be able to draw lexicon from two languages in her speech." The opposite is true for a speaker who shows more intersentential switching; he has "spoken out against 'mixing' languages."

Ana Zentella (1977:15) suggests that the tendency of her subjects to switch single nouns and noun phrases in interviews could be attributed to

their trying to maintain the language used by the interviewer, except for unfamiliar or difficult terms. In spontaneous conversation, they were not constrained in this way and so could switch in advance of a term they lacked, perhaps thus explaining the higher frequency of major-constituent switches in spontaneous conversation.

This same tendency is also apparent in the breakdown of code switching varieties given by Pfaff (1976) where she found more single-word switches in speech in which the participants seemed to be trying to maintain Spanish as the base language, but more switches at sentence or clause boundaries in casual conversation. Huerta's data contradicts these findings, however, because although her subjects seemed to be operating from a base language, they preferred intersentential switches; but the different analysis methods may explain this.

2. Constraints on Switches

Various constraints have been postulated for code switching, but those which seem to be the most universal were defined by Poplack (1980) as follows:

(a) The free morpheme constraint - a switch may not occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless the latter has been phonologically integrated into the language of the bound morpheme.

In other words, a switch may be made after the English lexical forms swim and run to the Spanish bound morpheme -eando only if the English word has been phonologically adapted to Spanish:

*[swIm] - eando	*[r-n] - eando
[swim] - eando	[rrun]- eando

(b) The equivalence constraint - the order of sentence constituents immediately adjacent to and on both sides of the switch point must be grammatical with respect to both languages involved simultaneously.

This constraint permits switches of only those constituents which are generated by similar grammatical rules in both languages. Poplack points out that both fluent and non-fluent bilinguals observed this constraint so that ungrammatical combinations were negligible in her data. (1979:40).

3. Motivations For Switches

Various reasons why people code switch have been postulated by researchers: the filling in of lexical gaps, either of denotation, connotation

or register, the marking of discourse for metaphoric purposes or social statements, the following of a "least-effort principle" in articulation, and a striving for the fullest expression possible.

A. Lexical Gaps

Lexical gaps in one language seem to motivate switches to terms from the other, and may be of three different kinds.

1. Gaps in Denotation

A kind of gap which accounts for many instances of code switching in her data is labeled limited access to terms by Elías-Olivares (1976: 183-186). She points out that the lack of availability of a term may not be because of a lexical gap in the language but because of a speaker's or a community's unfamiliarity with the term. For example, some Chicanos may have a limited vocabulary in Spanish because of little schooling in it, and because many aspects of their daily lives utilize an English lexicon, so that they have never been exposed to certain equivalent Spanish terms.

Huerta (1978:47) has also observed that lexical gaps may exist either in the lexicon of a language or in the lexicon of an individual speaker. In either case the speaker "has no choice" but to fill these gaps with words from the other language. However, contrary to Elías-Olivares, Huerta believes that this will account for only a few single item switches. In her study she found that many single-item switches were common words which everyone knows in both languages, or were words which occurred elsewhere in the data in their equivalent forms of the other language, showing that non-availability was not the cause of most single-item switching.

2. Gaps in Connotation

A more likely cause, Huerta points out, is that apparently equivalent terms in two languages may not have the same connotations so that, in order to convey a more exact meaning, a speaker will resort to a term from the other language. "Often two terms . . . which are dictionary equivalents are not so for the native bilingual, for whom use of either term will actually connote subtle differences in meaning." (Huerta, 1978:101). Evidently, then, switches are motivated not only for referential meanings but also for connotations. A language may apparently have an equivalent term; i.e., have no obvious gap in the lexicon for a word in another language, but in reality

a gap may exist in the connotational field of the word. Professional translators must fill in these gaps by substituting phrases for single-word items, or vice versa, in order to best convey the original meaning, while bilingual speakers have the option of simply substituting the word with the precise meaning from the other language, when speaking with other bilinguals. For example, Huerta indicates that the word terca in Spanish may convey a different notion than its counterpart stubborn in English, or papá and padre may have different connotations than dad or father to certain individuals.

3. Gaps in Register

Another factor to take into account and which is related to this, is that, while a speaker may have access to a "dictionary equivalent" of a term, it may be in a register other than the one they are using and the term which is in the correct register that comes to mind first may be from the lexicon of the other language. The following illustrates this:

Voy con mis cuates a boogie en el nuevo bar. (I'm going with my buddies to boogie at the new bar.)

In this made-up example, the colloquialism cuates (buddies) requires a less formal word than bailar 'to dance' so that the speaker might make a single-word switch to the English slang term boogie. Following is a similar example:

The baby is cabezuda like my old man. (stubborn)

Here the colloquial and rather derogatory old man for husband requires a less formal word than stubborn and cabezuda might come to mind before hard-headed, the closest English counterpart in the same register.

This switching to preserve the style of the utterance may occur also at clause level as noted by Elías-Olivares (1976:188) so that a more, or less, formal construction will be chosen in keeping with the overall tone of the utterance.

B. Metaphoric Reasons

Code switching sometimes serves as a rhetorical device used to achieve special effects, or to mark certain moods, much as a writer "foregrounds" certain phrases by putting them in a new context. This has been called metaphoric switching (Gumperz and Hernández-Chávez, 1978:[illegible]) and may include emphatic or emotional utterances such as the following examples:

1. Emphatic

A switch may emphasize a statement as in this example (Huerta, 1978:108):

M: Así como está ahí está perfect. (The way you are there you are perfect.)

2. Emotional

A switch may indicate strong emotion such as anger or frustration, as in the following (Huerta, 1978:107):

Mi: . . . pero no más por caprichosa no quiere. (. . . she just doesn't want to because she's stubborn.)

A: I can't!

C. Social Reasons

As mentioned earlier, situational code switching is caused by changes in the social situation. Conversational (or intra-discourse) code switching can also be motivated by social factors, apart from changes in participants, topic or setting, as in the following examples:

1. To Show Solidarity

A switch may indicate solidarity between group members, as in the following example from Elías-Olivares (1976:185):

I'll tell you what I was thinking of right now YA QUE STAMOS TODOS JUNTITOS, Could anybody help on telephoning people? (Now that we're all together)

2. Connection With A Domain

The words library and teacher were often used by Huerta's subjects instead of their Spanish counterparts because of their connection with the education domain, which generally is associated with English in the United States. Similarly, the words income and salesman were used because of their connection with the domain of business. (Huerta, 1978:102-3).

Poplack (1979:69-70) feels that metaphorical and social factors may be present in emblematic switching, but that intimate switching seems to be "an overall discourse mode . . . part of the repertoire of a speech community," the choice of which in itself makes a social statement.

D. Least-Effort Principle

Many switches may occur not because a term is absent or non-equivalent but because it is shorter or easier to say in the other language. Examples of words which are shorter in English are:

typewriter	máquina de escribir
heating	calefacción
major	especialización

Speakers have been observed to follow a "principle of maximum ease of articulation" in articulatory and acoustic studies with regard to pronunciation (Peter Ladefoged, 1975:235). It is quite conceivable that code switching may have this principle as one of its motivations.

E. Fullest Expression

The overall motivation for code switching appears to be the accomplishment of the goal of speech -- communication -- in the most succinct way possible by manipulating the structures of two languages rather than those of one language as monolinguals do. This need to "set semanticity as a first criterion" (Huerta, 1978:126), and to strive for precise communication is noted by Wentz (1977) in discussing what he calls code-mixing: "the inclusion of elements of one code in a sentence or constituent of another code [is] used principally for the expression of a more apposite unit." As Zentella (1977:15) puts it, bilinguals probably feel most completely at home, linguistically speaking, in the presence of other bilinguals because they are free to use their entire speech repertoire and are "thereby able to express themselves more fully." Code switching in these circumstances is so automatic as to be below conscious awareness. Haugen comments on this phenomenon in the Norwegian-American community: "Speakers will often be quite unaware that they are switching back and forth; they are accustomed to having bilingual speakers before them, and know that whichever language they use, they will be understood." (Haugen, 1969:65)

V. COMPARISON OF TERMINOLOGY

	TERMS THAT ARE GENERALLY EQUIVALENT	TERMS THAT OVERLAP WITH THEM	TERMS THAT ARE DISTINCT
CLASSES OF SWITCHES	conversational intra-discourse	metaphoric stylistic	situational
SENTENCE SWITCHES	between sentences at sentence level whole sentence at sentence boundary intersentential	between utterances code-changing cross language reference	
WITHIN-SENTENCE SWITCHES	at word level at word boundary within constituents intimate switching intrasentential	within utterances at constituent level at constituent boundary code-mixing code-changing emblematic switching semi-code-switching	
BORROWING	borrowings proper nouns specialized terms untranslatable terms	tag-like switching ethnic identity markers code-mixing semi-code-switching emblematic switching extrasentential	
LANGUAGE	base language matrix language matrix code	sentence language	
SPEAKER	fluent bilingual balanced bilingual compound bilingual		L_1 dominant
CONSTRAINT	free-morpheme		equivalence

VI. Conclusion

Research on Spanish/English code switching has been reviewed and the definitions and categories set up by the investigators have been examined. Their methods of locating, limiting, and classifying true code switches have been compared, together with the terms used and the results obtained.

These studies have shown that conversational, or intra-discourse, code switching must be separated from situational, or stylistic code switching, because the latter is motivated by obvious social factors while the former may have various motivations such as filling lexical gaps, foregrounding, signaling solidarity or facilitating communication. The research has also shown that intrasentential (within sentence) switching is more interesting linguistically than intersentential (full sentence) switching because of the complexity of combining within a single sentence elements generated by the rules of two different grammatical systems. But not all intrasentential switches are equally revealing in this respect because some terms (emblematic switches) can be placed almost anywhere in a sentence without violating grammatical rules. For that reason researchers have further narrowed their focus to concentrate upon intimate switching, the alternation of integral parts of the grammatical structure of a sentence.

It has usually been found necessary to exclude terms already borrowed by the community, as well as switches triggered by special constructions such as translations or quotations. Proficiency, attitude and education are all seen to affect the type of code switching a speaker will engage in, but all speakers seem to observe two basic rules: the free morpheme constraint (no within-word switches) and the equivalence constraint (no ungrammatical sentences). Motivations for switching may be lexical, rhetorical, social, articulatory, or expressive.

I have shown here that the different results obtained by the investigators may be due to their different analysis methods; i.e., whether each language change is counted as a switch point or whether only deviations from a base language are counted. Contradictory findings in the kinds of switches favored may be partially explained by these differences in methodologies, and also by different ways of classifying switches. I have examined the terminology which has been employed in the various studies, thereby clarifying when the same or different phenomena are being discussed, and

delineating what is, and is not, code switching. This will prove useful in the planning of data gathering and analysis methods which will collect, and concentrate on, those aspects of bilingual behavior most relevant to an understanding of how the human brain processes language.

One thing that the evidence dealt with in this paper already makes clear, however, is that there is little justification for the stigma associated with language mixing which has prevailed in the educational system. It indicates that linguistic borrowing is not "corruption" of a language but an inevitable, natural process which happens in any contact situation and that language itself should not be regarded as a symbol of status but as a means of communication. It suggests that all the energy that is spent prescribing, and proscribing, arbitrary grammatical and phonological forms and rules could be better exercised in training children to more effectively utilize the different varieties in their own speech repertoires, and to better understand the use which others make of theirs. The research explored here rejects the notion that Spanish/English intrasentential code switching is a deficient language form. With this paper I hope to aid continuing investigation and research which will replace that misconception with a recognition of the real nature of code switching: a natural striving by members of a bilingual speech community for the fullest communication possible by using the complete range of expressive devices available in the linguistic repertoire.

NOTES

[1]This idea originated with my professor John Baugh.

[2]For an analysis of situations, see Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City: Doubleday. 1959, or Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

[3]Huerta calls this a nested double switch on page 35, but this is apparently before the decision was made to designate these as only one instance of switching, which is explained on page 55.

REFERENCES

Elías-Olivares, Lucía. 1976. "Ways of Speaking in a Chicano Community: A Sociolinguistic Approach." PhD dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

Gumperz, John J. 1974. "The Sociolinguistic Significance of Conversational Code-Switching." Working Paper #46, Berkeley: Language-Behavior Research Laboratory. (Cited in Huerta, 1978:7-8).

Gumperz, John J. and Eduardo Hernández-Chávez. 1978. "Bilingualism, Bidialectalism, and Classroom Interaction." In Lourie and Conklin, 1978.

Haugen, Einar. 1969. The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hernández-Chávez, Eduardo, Andrew D. Cohen and Anthony F. Beltramo. 1975. El Lenguaje de los Chicanos. Arlington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Huerta, Ana Graciela. 1978. "Code Switching Among Spanish-English Bilinguals: A Sociolinguistic Perspective." PhD dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

Jacobson, Rodolfo. 1976. "The Social Implications of Intrasentential Code-Switching." ERIC # ED 136-587.

Ladefoged, Peter. 1975. A Course in Phonetics. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Lance, Donald M. 1975. "Spanish-English Code Switching." In Hernández-Chávez, Cohen, and Beltramo, 1975.

Lourie, Margaret A. and Nancy Faires Conklin, eds. 1978. A Pluralistic Nation: The Language Issue in the United States. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

McClure, Erica F. 1977. "Aspects of Code-Switching in the Discourse of Bilingual Mexican-American Children." Technical Report #49. Urbana: Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois.

Pfaff, Carol W. 1976. "Functional and Structural Constraints on Syntactic Variation in Code-Switching." In Steever, Walker, and Mufwene, 1976.

Poplack, Shana, 1979. "Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL": Toward a Typology of Code-Switching." Centro de Estudios Purrtoriqueños Working Papers. New York: CUNY.

Poplack, Shana. 1980. "Grammars in Contact." Paper presented at The University of Texas, Austin, March 17.

Poplack, Shana, et al. 1979. "Inter-Generational Perspectives on Bilingualism: From Community to Classroom." Paper presented at the National Institute of Education Conference on Teaching as a Linguistic Process. July 9-11, 1979, Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Steever, Sanford B., Carol A. Walker, and Salikoko S. Mufwene, eds. 1976. Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Tina, L.A. 1975. "Spanish-English Code-Switching: el porque y how not to." Romance Philology, 28-4, May.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1964. Languages in Contact. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

Wentz, James Paul. 1977. "Some considerations in the development of a syntactic description of code-switching." PhD dissertation abstract, University of Illinois at Urbana.

Zentella, Ana Celia. 1977. "Code Switching and Interactions Among Puerto Rican Children." Working Paper in Sociolinguistics. 50. Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.